論文

日本の教育に於ける英語のデベートの導入概論

English Debate in the Japanese Classroom: An Introductory Outline

Harry HARRIS

Ⅰ. INTRODUCTION

Debate in the EFL classroom in Japan has its advocates and critics. The former maintain that students in Japan, as students elsewhere, can and will debate in English if they are provided relevant and provocative topics and the guidance and monitoring necessary to help them engage in debate. On the other hand, some of the latter propose that the English-language skills of many students in Japan are just too weak for them to succeed in meeting the demands of debate in that language whereas others suggest that cultural restraints make it difficult or impossible for Japanese students to give the opinions so necessary in an activity of this type. This writer supports the first stance, with the additional view that even students in Japan with relatively weak English skills can do suitably simplified debates, when given clear, concise topics, careful, coherent guidance, and consistent and insistent

monitoring.

If we understand debate in its broadest sense to mean, as Branham (1991) so succinctly puts it, "the process by which opinions are advanced, supported, disputed, and defended" (p.1), there is too much counter-evidence at all levels of Japanese society to support the proposition that Japanese do not or cannot give opinions. From the most mundane, inconsequential discussions about what to have for dinner to the most worldly, significant ones about whether to change the constitution or the education system, no matter how obliquely or obtusely, Japanese offer opinions, support opinions, question opinions, and defend opinions. One sees evidence of this in the newspapers and the halls of academia just as in the pubs and bathhouses of suburbia. Any claim to the contrary made in unreserved and unqualified terms is untenable.

However, even if we narrow the idea of debate to one more congruent with that of *The Encyclopœdia Britannica Online*'s definition of it, one which conveys the sense of a contest — a "formal, oral confrontation between two individuals, teams, or groups who present arguments to support opposing sides of a question, generally according to a set form or procedure" — it is important to note that there is an Asian, *and East Asian,* tradition of debating, as in India (Branham, 1991, pp.8-10), China (Branham, 1991, pp.10-12), and feudal and later Japan (Branham, 1991, pp.12-13). (See *Nippon no Kore Kara* [2006] for NHK's long-term debate series on serious issues Japan faces; see also *Ota Hikari no Watashiga Soridaijin ni Nattara ... Hisho Tanaka* [2006] for Nihon TV's popularized weekly debate program.) Also germane to this argument is the fact that post-War Japan has had organized debates *in English* for

university students from 1950 and debates *in Japanese* for junior high and high school students from 1997 (Yasui, 1999).

Evidently, then, there is nothing cultural that should irrevocably prevent students in Japan from engaging in debate in their own language(s) or in English. Just as anywhere else, however, meaningful debate here requires — especially for younger people — training and monitoring to promote a sense of focus and responsibility, in terms of a commitment to prepare for the activity and cooperate with fellow team members. With this in mind, this paper supports the proposition that debates in English are a viable and valuable, and consequently desirable, educational experience in Japanese EFL classrooms — even with students whose English skills are relatively basic — and presents an outline to help organize them.

As you read this paper, please keep in mind that as professional educators, we are all subject to different variables with which we have to contend when we teach — from large classes that make individualized attention difficult, to small classes that make effective group work a challenge; from classes taught in truncated time slots that leave us with little time to get things done, to classes taught in much longer ones that require that we pace our activities to ensure that we continue to educate; from motivated classes that keep us on our professional toes to meet the demands of the students, to demanding classes that keep us on our professional toes to motivate them; from lately-lunched, sleep-starved classes of young students on early midsummer afternoons, to dog-tired, not-yet-dined classes of more mature professionals on late winter evenings. Below follows an outline for doing semi-formal, classroom-

friendly English debates, based on this writer's own experiences with them at universities, language schools, and elsewhere in Japan. The outline is meant to provide an introductory, *manipulable,* framework, with the potential to evolve according to the variables of the classroom, requiring the adaptation of the time frames, charts, forms, explanations, and terminology to the constraints encountered. Readers who are familiar with the literature will notice that the outline proposes a type of debate that differs from such formal debates as Parliamentary, which require little or no evidence and in which audience participation may be encouraged, from team policy debates, which often require a great deal of evidence often read at great speed, and from Lincoln-Douglas debates, which are one-on-one. (See Whitman, "Debate Formats," [2000] for a brief summary of these and other kinds of debates.) However, here, at this point, this writer is proposing debates that are differently structured, less formal, and non audience-directed because of the ease and speed with which they can be set up and carried out in our busy lives. Nevertheless, any adaptation deriving from the ideas offered in the outline and resulting in more formal contests, whether intra- or inter-institutional, is certainly unreservedly encouraged and warmly applauded.

Ⅱ. WHY DEBATE?

Research indicates that debate is an activity that teaches very important skills and ideas. (See, for example, Combs and Bourne [1994] for highlights on this research and for the results of a specific study of the effects on business students; see Geracimos [2004] for a less academic but equally persuasive article about the effects of debate on the thinking, speaking, and even writing skills of American high school

students; see Mochizuki [2003, pp.16-17] for a well-expressed and, perhaps, timely appeal that debate motivates students and that it instills an interest in social issues, which in turn can help many students academically, for example, with research papers.) Students who engage in debate can improve their ability in the following areas:

• *Research and analysis of specific issues:* Most debate propositions require that students get information from library, Internet, or other sources. Students learn how to access this information and select what is appropriate for the demands of debate. As a consequence, they learn about issues that can be important to their lives and pick up skills that they can use in other areas of their academic life, and beyond.

• *Critical thinking:* Preparation for and participation in debate trains students to evaluate, *actively,* what they read and hear and may say. Students learn to examine their own biases and those of others.

• *Reasoned discourse:* Participation in debate trains students to speak logically and rationally, controlling emotions that might impair their ability to communicate their opinions. Most students learn very quickly that this loss of control can result in a lost debate as well as peer disapproval.

• *Work with others:* The cooperative effort that debate demands helps students to improve their social skills and their ability to resolve conflicts. Essentially, they learn to solve problems with others using their intellect.

• *Language usage:* Whether students debate in their native language or in another one, they can learn vocabulary and improve general language skills.

Finally, as Snyder (1999) so well puts it, "Debate is about change. We are constantly engaged in a struggle to make our lives, our community, our country, our world, our future, a better one." Debate encourages students to accept the idea that their own efforts can have an effect on the events that are developing around them, helping them understand that they are responsible for learning about important issues and responding when their actions may make a difference. Debate invites students to understand that they can take control of their lives.

Ⅲ. THE FIRST, INTRODUCTORY, DEBATE

To restate some of the ideas above, the following outline is meant for instructors with little time who want to get their students involved in debate quickly. As such, readers will notice that this outline may allow students to debate on the day that this activity is introduced. However, alternatively, educators who find themselves in instructional situations with more time may want to introduce debate concepts and materials in earlier sessions, preparing students for debate more methodically, perhaps ensuring that students have a firmer, earlier, grip on such debate requirements as research/preparation, organization, and terminology. By all means, if such is the case, you are encouraged to do so. You are also encouraged to choose from the ideas below, adapting them to your schedule and to the needs of your students. If you can do so, then the purpose of this paper will have been further

served.

A. When introducing debate to a class, the instructor should begin by explaining, *in language that students understand,* what debate is not: it is not a fight－your opponents are not your enemies, but your colleagues, with whom you are exploring a particular issue; it is not necessarily an opportunity to argue your most cherished ideas and ideals, but one in which you may well, indeed, find yourself playing devil's advocate arguing points with which you personally vehemently disagree. Debate, it *should* be explained, is a cooperative effort to examine, and therefore learn about, issues that can be important in our lives. Debate, it *can* be explained to your students, will be a cooperative effort during which they will be asked to help choose a timely topic, or proposition, prepare cogent reasons, or *arguments,* in support of (*pro*) or in disagreement with (*con*) the proposition, and perhaps prepare counter-arguments, or refutations, and even counter-refutations, or rebuttals. (The literature uses these terms inconsistently; however, see McGinnis [1954] for an affirmation that *refutation* "is the process of attacking, weakening, tearing down, or destroying the argument of an opponent." whereas *rebuttal* "is the process of defending, strengthening, and rebuilding arguments after they have been attacked by an opponent" [pp.125-126]. At any rate, whatever terminology you choose to use, it is important to remember to be clear and consistent when teaching and using it.)

B. When students understand the above, the instructor next elicits propositions from them. In this writer's experience, this routinely results in such responses as *summer* (This is a genuine response.), in which case it can be explained that this is not phrased as

something to defend or oppose, unlike *Summer is better than winter.; Chocolate is tasty.* (This is a genuine response.), in which case it can be explained that propositions must be debatable; and *Not getting enough exercise is not good.* (This is a slightly contrived response that resulted in a very confused and confusing past debate.), in which case it can be explained that propositions should be expressed clearly and simply, with no negatives. (For further discussion of the requirements of propositions, see Branham, 1991, pp.31-34; for discussion of the types of propositions－value (i.e. *Which is better?*), policy (i.e. *What should be done?*), and fact (i.e. *Is this true?*)－see Goodnight, 1993, pp.39-44; for an invaluable database of [some easy, though mostly intermediate and advanced] debate propositions with "background summaries, links to websites of interest and recommended books, example motions and user comments," see International Debate Education Association, 2005).

C. After the class has agreed upon a proposition (Students can vote on this, or the instructor can decide on one.), the instructor should write the topic－say, *Cats are better pets than dogs.*－on the blackboard. The instructor then places students into groups of five and subdivides each group into two teams, one to be *pro* and the other *con,* with two members each. The remaining student in each group will be the judge. Tell the class that each judge will evaluate the debate performance of his or her teams, ultimately determining a winning team based on judging criteria that the instructor will explain, and that, adhering to that criteria, each team must try to persuade the judge that it represents a better-argued, better-demonstrated position. (To encourage the idea that students should

be able to debate either side of a proposition, the instructor may want to determine the *pro* and *con* teams. Students will invariably choose a position with which they agree or which they perceive to be easier. As for the size of the teams, larger ones will mean less discussion time for individual students; of course, anything smaller results in a one-on-one debate, which precludes the invaluable experience gained from team cooperation before and during the debate.

D. The instructor then should explain judging criteria of which students will need to be aware when they debate and which the judges will use as a basis for deciding the winners. (*Judging Criteria* in APPENDIX 1, p.12, offers a sample of criteria that the instructor may want students to keep in mind. Especially for basic classes, this will need to be simplified and carefully explained. At any rate, for this first, introductory, debate, anticipate your need to move from group to group during the debate, reminding students of the more obvious criteria, encouraging students to sit up straight, look each other in the eye, and speak audibly. Wait until future classes when students have had more meaningful exposure to debate to hold students accountable for many of the criteria.)

E. The instructor then has the two teams in each group prepare three arguments apiece for their *pro* and *con* positions. (You may want to separate these teams physically and, in the spirit of *the more heads the better,* even let them work with teams from other groups.) While the students are working on their arguments, the instructor should take the judges to a separate area of the classroom and

explain, *again,* the judging criteria that will be used. At this time, also give them guidelines for scoring the debate, as in the example in APPENDIX 2, p.13, or provide them with a similar score sheet. If there is time left over, have the group of judges work together on their own *pro* and *con* arguments. This will help them during the debate.

F. When the class is ready, go over a schedule with your class, as in APPENDIX 3, p.14, explaining how the debate will be conducted. Then make clear the following to your students:

1. Team members should take turns during the debate, i.e. one person should not do all of the talking. Also, when team members speak, they should refer to themselves collectively as *we,* not *I,* to show that they are expressing group ideas, not just their own.

2. The debate will be timed with a stopwatch.

3. During the 1½-minute affirmative/negative argument periods, the opponents should just listen and take notes. This is not a time for two-way discussion or refutation. If there are communication problems, debaters look to the judge to ask for requests for clarification. Alternatively, they can just say that they do not understand.

4. During the 5-minute break for preparing questions, teams again work separately in their groups to formulate questions about

things that they did not understand, preparing requests for further explanations, examples, definitions, etc.

5. During the 3-minute question periods, students ask their questions. Tell them that if their opponents are slow to respond they should go on to their next question. They should not waste the opportunity to get information from their opponents. Remind students, however, to do their best in answering questions.

6. During the 5-minute break for preparing refutations, teams again work separately in their groups, using their own ideas and information gathered during the 3-minute question period to prepare refutations of their opponents' arguments.

7. During the 1-minute refutation periods, again, the opponents should just listen and take notes. Instructors may want to remind their students that new arguments cannot be presented at this time.

8. During the 2-minute break for preparing the final appeal to the judge, team members review their own ideas and those of their opponents. They will use these in a final attempt to convince the judge that their team has, in fact, more persuasively argued and defended the proposition.

9. The final appeal is the last chance for teams to present their cases to the judge, pointing out strengths in their own

arguments and the failure of their opponents to refute these successfully as well as the weaknesses of the opponent team's arguments. What they say here could invite acceptance or rejection from the judge.

10. After the debate, the judge will evaluate each team and determine the winner.

G. Conduct the debate. During this period, the instructor should travel from group to group, basically just listening but also assisting debaters and judges when there are problems.

IV. SUBSEQUENT DEBATES

Unlike with the first debate, students will have time to prepare for debates for later classes and should be expected to do so. (See below, **V. ACCOUNTABILITY.**) The instructor can also expect students increasingly to observe the judging criteria that have been introduced to the class but should be prepared to monitor and guide students. Depending on the time constraints of the class, work can be done, as suggested above, with transitional expressions helpful or necessary in debate and with debate fallacies. (See below, **VI. DEBATE FALLACIES.**) With some classes, the instructor can and may need to provide guidance as to how to use such resources as libraries and the Internet to obtain support for arguments. This may be especially necessary when working with students who have fewer academic or computer skills, though students in classes with a mixture of these needs often help each other and should be encouraged to do so. Also, related to information gathering, this writer tells students that they can

use any language they wish to do their research—including Japanese—one of the main goals being to encourage students to read and evaluate materials from different sources and to learn.

V. ACCOUNTABILITY

To ensure that classroom debates result in effective educational experiences, it is very important to monitor students. As in other areas of education, instructors who do not do this invite situations in which students arrive unprepared and unmotivated for the task at hand. As Cotton (2001) points out, research indicates that "holding students accountable for their work... facilitates learning and enhances achievement" and that "collecting [that] homework... communicate[s] to students that teachers are serious about effort and completion of assignments." In the context of a debate, and preparation for one, monitoring might mean that the instructor require that students come to class with something in hand indicating that they have done some investigation into the topic. (The alternative, in my experience, could well be students who show up at a debate class, seat themselves in the back, and hastily jot down ideas while the roll is called.) To encourage this fuller participation, this writer requires students to hand in, for a grade, typed notes as in *Form 1* or *Form 2* in APPENDIX 4, p.15, and APPENDIX 5, p.16, respectively.

Form 1 requires that students prepare merely three *pro* and three *con* arguments for the debate. This form is ideal for motivated groups of students who are fairly confident in their use, and perhaps fairly insouciant about their misuse, of English. It is useful not only for

short, incomplete debates but also for fuller debates in which students provide arguments, refutations, and perhaps even rebuttals but in which the instructor wants to promote spontaneity. Students provide evidence that they have done some pre-planning, but the form, with its abbreviated notes, presupposes that during the debate students will perhaps more freely draw upon their own linguistic, and other, resources to support their positions.

Form 2, though technically requiring more evident preparation, may mean less challenging debates as students are required to plan out their responses in more detail—which, arguably, should be a goal in debates. (That said, as *per* the comments made above about *Form 1*, it could also quite convincingly be argued that, where possible, linguistic spontaneity is an equally valid goal in the English classroom.) However, instructors with less experienced and/or less confident students might want to use this, allowing students to read their notes. In fact, with especially novice students, in terms of their English-language skills, instructors may want to consider having students prepare and hand in their notes well enough in advance for them to be checked and returned so that students can use the corrected notes during the debate, the guiding principle here being that the weaker the English skills, the more support the instructor may want to provide. (Incidentally, for instructors with classes with the time and need, the form could be extended to include rebuttals. This writer has seldom had that time and not often felt that need, however.)

VI. DEBATE FALLACIES

At some point, preferably in some of the beginning debate classes, students who are learning to do debate should be introduced to the idea of fallacies, which may be defined as reasoning that does not satisfy acceptable conditions in a formal argument. It should be explained to students that debate stresses logic and that, therefore, a statement such as (admittedly extreme) *It snowed because the children danced.* is unacceptable, remaining an assertion unless proved, somehow. It should also be pointed out that, different from the context of most ordinary, everyday conversations, in a debate one must try to prove his or her ideas scientifically, avoiding claims based on cultural beliefs, natural feelings, or just hearsay. Finally, it should be explained that all debaters should work hard to avoid fallacious reasoning, being careful not to use ambiguous language or unquestioned assumptions.

Because the scope of this paper is semi-formal debate and because there is a plethora of fallacies (Labossiere [1995] lists and explains, for example, 42 of these while Whitman [2001] does the same with 21. See both of these writers for detailed explanations.), instructors might want to limit their introduction to the following more conspicuous ones, leaving the unmentioned majority to professional logicians:

A. OVERGENERALIZATION
B. FALSE CAUSE
C. IGNORING THE ISSUE

A. *OVERGENERALIZATION* – This fallacy results when going from a

general case to a specific case, or vice versa. For example, to say that it is wrong to kill is a fallacy since many would agree that killing in self-defense could be an exception. Equally, others might say that killing as a legal form of punishment is acceptable. The person who makes this assertion needs to qualify it, perhaps saying that it is wrong to take human life arbitrarily and unnecessarily. As an example of going from a specific to a general case, it is a fallacy to say that, based on your experience, cell phones are a useless device and, consequently, should be banned from public use. Many people find cell phones useful, especially in emergencies. You must remember that others have experiences, and needs, that are different from yours.

B. *FALSE CAUSE*—This fallacy results from assigning a wrong or false cause to a situation or event. Specific examples of this follow:

1. *AFTER THIS, THEREFORE, BECAUSE OF THIS*—This fallacy occurs when making an unsupported claim that a first event or condition causes a second one. For example, it is fallacious reasoning to make the unsupported claim that the existence of the death penalty deters violent crime. In a debate, when you make a statement similar to this, you must prove it. If you do not, it remains an assertion.

2. *EITHER-OR*—This fallacy occurs when one rationalizes something to be either "black or white." For example, if two countries go to war, it is fallacious reasoning to say it must be the fault of one or the other. It could be the fault of both. Explain your

blame.

C. *IGNORING THE ISSUE* — This fallacy often arises because the speaker may have trouble providing arguments *for* or *against* a topic and tries to avoid the issue. The following are specific examples:

1. *AD HOMINEM* — This term comes from the Latin words meaning "against the man." This fallacy occurs when the speaker attacks his opponent rather than the argument. For example, in a debate on *the voting rights of foreign residents in Japan,* if one speaker attacks another saying that "you are a foreign resident; therefore, of course you feel this way," his argumentation is fallacious since he is attacking the person, not his arguments.

2. *FALSE APPEALS TO AUTHORITY* — This fallacy involves an undeserved appeal to authority and dignity. For example, before you base you argument on the authority of, for example, Dr. Bunce, that cell phones cause cancer, you should find out whether s/he is a professor of Spanish or an M.D who has done the research. If you do not, your reasoning is fallacious.

3. *APPEALS TO IGNORANCE* — With this fallacy, the speaker tries to overwhelm the audience with a large vocabulary or with a large amount of materials about which s/he may know little. Communication is imperative in debate, and so potentially confusing vocabulary as well as graphs, charts, statistics, etc., should be explained. Not to do so defeats the purpose of debate.

Ⅶ. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Debate in English-language (and other) classrooms in Japan is an educational approach that can be carried out, provided instructors adapt their methodology to the needs of their students. Whether done with beginning, intermediate, or advanced classes, students can pick up knowledge that can provide them with deeper insights into the world around them as well as cognitive, academic, and social skills that can help them cope with future encounters in it, resulting in richer, more meaningful lives. The above outline is a step up that road, one which requires the steady hand of a guide who is willing to slow down, or speed up, the pace as necessary, and, of course, to offer encouragement and make demands.

This writer began having his EFL students do debates sometime early in his career in a language institute in Japan and learned very quickly that students in his classes were willing and able to argue topics, usually with initial hesitation but often with later passion, sometimes until well after the class session was over. Based on this experience and that of other members of a very devoted faculty at that institute, with the go-ahead from a supportive administration, curriculum changes were made in the program, adding a Debate course to the Intermediate level as well as lead-up debate activities to the lower levels and further debate activities to the Advanced level. Not long after this, semester-final intra-level and inter-level debate contests were instituted with great success, much to the satisfaction and pleasure of the students, faculty, and administration. For some time, this writer has also been doing debates with university freshmen (who are graded on their preparation)

as well as with students elsewhere (who are not graded) and, despite the inevitable need to juggle and sometimes cajole, can say that he continues to be impressed by their accomplishments.

Organizing and carrying out debates in the EFL classroom in Japan may seem a daunting task to some. However, it is hoped that this paper will have provided some insights into doing so, thereby encouraging educators here (and elsewhere) to take the steps necessary to engage in this potentially productive activity. The rewards for our students, and eventually the community, are too great not to do so.

APPENDIX 1

JUDGING CRITERIA[1]

ORGANIZATION	Information is presented in a clear, logical order with transitions[2].
DEFINITIONS	Words that might cause misunderstandings in the proposition and the debate are clearly defined.
CONSISTENCY, RELEVANCE	Ideas are logical[3] and consistent with each other and with other ideas presented during the debate. Arguments, data, examples, etc., are related to the proposition.
BODY LANGUAGE	Body language[4] is appropriate to debate and reinforces arguments. Team members sit up straight and have good eye contact when speaking.
VOICE	Debaters speak clearly and audibly in a tone of voice appropriate to debate[5].
EXAMPLES, FACTS, DATA, STATISTICS, SOURCES	Clear and reputable support is provided for the arguments, showing research and/or serious thought done on a proposition.
EFFECTIVENESS	Debaters use information provided by the opponent team to point out contradictions, inconsistencies, irrelevancies and fallacies, thereby neutralizing the arguments, definitions and data presented by their opponents.

[1] This writer often includes an **ENGLISH** category, whereby students are encouraged to use all English.

[2] At some future point, the instructor may want to provide a list of these and go over them.

[3] See **VI. DEBATE FALLACIES** above.

[4] Insist on good posture and eye contact from day one. Slouching sends out a negative message; monotone reading from notes without occasionally looking at others does too.

[5] Insist on this from day one.

APPENDIX 2

SCORE SHEET[1, 2]

PROPOSITION:					
PRO	0-5	NOTES	NOTES	0-5	CON
ORGANIZATION					ORGANIZATION
DEFINITIONS					DEFINITIONS
CONS/REL					CONS/REL
BODY LANG.					BODY LANG.
VOICE					VOICE
EXAMPLES, ETC.					EXAMPLES, ETC.
EFFECTIVENESS					EFFECTIVENESS
TOTAL					TOTAL

[1]The maximum total in each column is 35.
[2]Modify the scoring system and the form as necessary.

APPENDIX 3

SCHEDULE[1, 2]

PRO		CON	
1st AFFIRMATIVE ARG.[3]	**1½ minutes**	1st NEGATIVE ARG.	**1½ minutes**
2nd AFFIRMATIVE ARG.	**1½ minutes**	2nd NEGATIVE ARG.	**1½ minutes**
3rd AFFIRMATIVE ARG.	**1½ minutes**	3rd NEGATIVE ARG.	**1½ minutes**
5-MINUTE BREAK TO PREPARE QUESTIONS			
3-MINUTE QUESTION PERIOD		**3-MINUTE** QUESTION PERIOD	
5-MINUTE BREAK TO PREPARE REFUTATIONS			
REFUTATION OF CON'S 1st ARG.	**1min.**	REFUTATION OF PRO'S 1st ARG.	**1min.**
REFUTATION OF CON'S 2nd ARG.	**1min.**	REFUTATION OF PRO'S 2nd ARG.	**1min.**
REFUTATION OF CON'S 3rd ARG.	**1min.**	REFUTATION OF PRO'S 3rd ARG.	**1min.**
2-MINUTE BREAK TO PREPARE FINAL APPEAL TO JUDGE			
FINAL APPEAL	**1 minute**	FINAL APPEAL	**1 minute**

[1] Adapt the time constraints to the level of your class. Longer periods of *free* speaking can be painful and unproductive for students with less developed English skills.

[2] The total time this debate should take is 35 minutes, not including orientation and preparation.

[3] ARGUMENT

APPENDIX 4

FORM 1

Name	Date
PROPOSITION: Cats make better pets than dogs.[1]	
PRO ARGUMENTS	CON ARGUMENTS
1.Cats are more independent than dogs. You can therefore leave them alone for longer periods in your modern, busy life. You also don't have to take them for walks. 2.Cats are generally quieter than dogs. They don't disturb neighbors by barking. 3.Cats are cleaner and easier to take care of than dogs. You don't have to bathe them. They eat less than most dogs. When dogs go to the bathroom, you have to clean up after them. Cats bury their mess.	1.Dogs can guard the homes of their owners by barking and even protect their owners. Big dogs are especially useful for protection. 2.Dogs offer closer, more constant companionship because they are not solitary animals. Therefore, they are especially good in these times when people live lonelier lives. 3.Dogs can be taught to do tricks and other things to entertain and help people. They can learn dozens of commands, which shows that they are more intelligent than cats.

[1] Instructors with more challenging goals may want to use a proposition like this in the first debate, moving on to more "important" propositions in subsequent debates.

APPENDIX 5

FORM 2

Name	Date
PROPOSITION: Cats make better pets than dogs.	
PRO ARGUMENTS	**CON ARGUMENTS**
1.Cats are more independent than dogs, so you can leave them for longer periods in your modern, busy life. You also don't have to take them for walks. 2.Cats are generally quieter than dogs. They don't disturb neighbors by barking. 3.Cats are cleaner and easier to take care of than dogs. You don't have to bathe them. They eat less than most dogs. When dogs go to the bathroom, you have to clean up after them. Cats bury their mess.	1.Dogs can guard the homes of their owners by barking and even protect their owners. Big dogs are especially useful for protection. 2.Dogs offer closer, more constant companionship because they are not solitary animals, so they are especially good for lonely people. 3.Dogs can be taught to do tricks and other things to entertain and help people. They can learn dozens of commands, which shows that they are more intelligent than cats.
REFUTATION OF CON ARGUMENTS	**REFUTATION OF PRO ARGUMENTS**
1.However, often dogs bark unnecessarily, disturbing neighbors. They might also bite the wrong people. Big dogs can cause unnecessary fear. Scaring people unnecessarily is bad for human relations. 2.However, cats can also offer close, constant companionship, even though they are more solitary animals. A cat's companionship, by the way, requires effort. Also, cats display a wider range of emotions than dogs, among others annoyance, dislike, bliss, and disdain. These emotions offer more stimulation to lonely people. 3.However, that cats don't do tricks for people doesn't necessarily show that they are not intelligent. As a matter of fact, it shows that they are in control. We can learn contentment from this self-control.	1.However, if you want independent pets or independence from them then you don't need them. The point of keeping pets is interdependence. Also, taking your dog for a walk is healthy for you. 2. However, cats also make noise, and dogs can be taught not to bark. Anyway, barking can be good, especially when dogs are warning their owners of strangers. 3. However, again, that you own a dog means that you have responsibility for its care. Bathing it is part of that responsibility. As already stated, children can learn from this. It may be true that most dogs eat more than cats, but that is a responsibility you accept when you get a large dog. You also have to clean up after cats when they use their cat litter.

References

Branham, R. J. (1991). *Debate and critical analysis: The harmony of conflict.* Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Combs, H. W., & Bourne, S. G. (1994). The Renaissance of educational debate: Results of a five-year study of the use of debate in business education. *Electronic Journal on Excellence in College Teaching,* 5, 1, 57-67. Retrieved May 3, 2006, from Electronic Journal
Web site: http://ject.lib.muohio.edu/sample/pdf-to-text.php?article=53

Cotton, K. (2001). Monitoring student learning in the classroom. Retrieved Apr. 29, 2006, from NW Regional Educational Laboratory Web site: http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/sirs/2/cu4.html

The Encyclopædia Britannica Online. (2006). Retrieved Apr. 30, 2006, from Encyclopædia Online Web site: http://www.britannica.com/search?query=debate&submit=Find&source=MWTEXT

Geracimos, A. (2004). Debating wins. *The Washington Times.* Retrieved May 4, 2006, from Washington Times Web site: http://washingtontimes.com/metro/20040404-114146-2255r.htm

Goodnight, L. (1993). *Getting started in debate.* Second Edition. Lincolnwood, Ill.: National Textbook Company.

International Debate Education Association. (2005). Retrieved May 13, 2006, from International Debate Association Web site: http://www.idebate.org/debatabase/

Labossiere, M. C. (1995). Fallacies. *The Nizkor Project.* Retrieved May 7, 2006, from Nizkor Web site: http://www.nizkor.org/features/fallacies/

McGinnis, R. Y. (1954). Refutation. In David Potter (Ed.), *Argumentation and debate: Principles and practices* (pp.125-167). New York: The Dryden Press.

Mochizuki, K. (2003). *Debeto no susume.* Tokyo: Seibundo Press.

NHK. (Producer). (2006). *Nippon no Kore Kara.* [Television series]. Tokyo: NHK-G, TV-1.

Snyder, A. C. (1999). What is debate? *The code of the debater: Introduction to the way of reason.* Retrieved May 3, 2006, from Code of the Debater Web site http://debate.uvm.edu/code2001.pdf

Suga, K. (Chief Producer). (2006). *Ota Hikari no Watashiga Soridaijin ni Nattara ... Hisho Tanaka.* [Television series]. Tokyo: Nihon TV, TV-4.

Whitman, G. (2000). Debate formats. *Debate.* Retrieved May 7, 2006, from Glen Whitman Debate Web site: http://www.csun.edu/~dgw61315/debformats.html

Whitman, G. (2001). Logical fallacies and the art of debate. *Debate.* Retrieved May 7, 2006, from Glen Whitman Debate Web site: http://www.csun.edu/~dgw61315/fallacies.html

Yasui, S. (1999). *Nihon no debeto katsudo no gaikyo.* Retrieved Apr. 30, 2006, from Japan Debate Association Web site: http://www.kt.rim.or.jp/~jda/

(本学発達科学部専任講師)